

Results; Community Interest and Opinion Survey For Local Parks and Recreation Facility Priorities. Granada Community Services District

Prepared By: Patrick Tierney Ph.D.
Professor of Recreation, Parks and Tourism
San Francisco State University

4/24/2015



Park Planning Process

The Standard Process for Park Planning Includes:

1. Inventory of Existing Park Facilities and Programs
 - In-House Assessment
 - MidCoast Community Council- Recreation documents/plans
2. Needs Assessment
 - Community Survey
 - Comparison with Standards/Local Communities
3. Recommendations – Facilities and Programs
 - Parks Advisory Committee
 - Public Hearings
4. Prioritization
5. Implementation

Community Survey Method

- Questionnaire developed by Granada Community Services District (GCSD)
 - Input from San Mateo County Parks Dept.
- In English and Spanish
- Mailed to 2,283 residences in district on 2/20/15
 - 2,235 were delivered
- Slightly different survey version on County website
- Data coded, entered by SFSU & local typist
- Raw data available in Excel and SPSS formats
- Data error checked and verified by Dr. Tierney
- Data analysis by Dr. Tierney, using IBM SPSS

Results

- Combined paper & online surveys, removed unusable surveys
- Total of 629 completed and usable surveys in database
- Response rate $629/2335=27.0\%$
- 562 mail responses and 67 online surveys

Type Survey			
		Frequency	Valid Percent
	Mail	562	89.3
	Online	67	10.7
	Total	629	100.0

Age of Respondent Household Residents

Age of Respondents In Households			
Age Range	Frequency	Total	Adult
		Percent	Percent
0-1	23	2.4%	
2-5	51	5.3%	
6-11	64	6.7%	
12-14	36	3.8%	
15-18	46	4.8%	
19-34	55	5.8%	7.5%
25-39	118	12.3%	16.0%
40-55	244	25.5%	33.2%
56-74	266	27.8%	36.1%
75+	53	5.5%	7.2%
	956	100.0%	100.0%

2010 San Mateo County Population			
From U.S. Census			
Age	Population	Percent	
20-24	40098	7.4	
25-36	99334	18.2	
35-49	164524	30.3	
50-64	143432	26.4	
66+	96262	17.7	
Total	543650	100	

Responding Households With Children Under 18 Years

		Frequency	Percent
Yes		186	29.6
Total Respondents		629	100.0

Where Do Respondents Live

What Neighborhood Do You Live In		
	Frequency	Percent
Clipper Ridge	69	11.4
El Granada	457	75.7
Miramar	69	11.4
Princeton	9	1.5
Total	604	100
	629	

Cell Location Of Household On Grid Overlay Of District

Map Location Cell	Frequency	Percent
1	57	14.8
2	4	1.0
3	39	10.1
4	41	10.6
5	35	9.1
6	78	20.3
7	5	1.3
8	23	6.0
9	50	13.0
10	41	10.6
11	12	3.1
Total	385	100.0

How Long Have They Lived Here

	Frequency	Valid Percent
Less than 1 year	26	4.3
1-5 years	114	18.8
6-10 years	81	13.3
11-15 years	100	16.4
16+ years	287	47.2
Total	608	100

Visited Local Parks In Last 12 Months

Park	Frequency	Percent
Coastal Trail	573	94.7
Mirada Surf West	453	83.3
Quarry Park	463	81.2
Clipper Ridge Park	185	41.7

Visited Clipper Ridge Park By Neighborhood

What Neighborhood Do You Live In By Visit Clipper Ridge Park Crosstabulation

Park		Visit Clipper Ridge Park		Total
		Yes	No	
Clipper Ridge	Count	61	0	61
	% within What N	100.00%	0.00%	100.00%
El Granada	Count	100	211	311
	% within What N	32.20%	67.80%	100.00%
Miramar (unincorporated)	Count	10	35	45
	% within What N	22.20%	77.80%	100.00%
Princeton	Count	3	3	6
	% within What N	50.00%	50.00%	100.00%
Total	Count	174	249	423
	% within What N	41.10%	58.90%	100.00%

Frequency of Visiting Local Parks

Frequency of Park Use, Reporting Frequently or Often

Park	Frequency	Percent
Coastal Trail	323	58.4
Mirada Surf West	263	51.9
Quarry Park	217	40.9
Clipper Ridge Park	168	35.5

Do Local Parks Need Improvement?



Do Local Parks Need Improvement

Do Local Parks Need Improvement		
	Frequency	Percent
Yes	310	52.3
No	116	19.6
Maybe	126	21.2
No Opinion	41	6.9
Total	593	100

Do Local Parks Need Improvement By Neighborhood

What Neighborhood Do You Live In By Do Local Parks Need Improvement Crosstabulation

		Do Local Parks Need Improvement			
Neighborhood		Yes	No	Maybe	No Opinion
Clipper Ridge	Count	43	7	8	4
	% within What	69.40%	11.30%	12.90%	6.50%
El Granada	Count	221	85	96	32
	% within What	50.90%	19.60%	22.10%	7.40%
Miramar (uninc)	Count	33	14	16	3
	% within What	50.00%	21.20%	24.20%	4.50%
Princeton	Count	6	1	1	1
	% within What	66.70%	11.10%	11.10%	11.10%
	Count	303	107	121	40
	% within What	53.10%	18.70%	21.20%	7.00%

There Are Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance

There Are Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance				
	Frequency	Valid Percent		
Yes	402	66.4		
Somewhat	131	21.7		
No	72	11.9		
Total	605	100		

Are There Sufficient Park Areas Within Walking Distance of Residence

Kids In Household By Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance Crosstabulation

Kids In HH		There Are Sufficient Park Areas In Walk			Total
		Yes	Somewhat	No	
Yes	Count	103	47	26	176
	% within KidsInH	58.50%	26.70%	14.80%	100.00%

Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance By Where You Live

Neighborhood You Live In By Sufficient Park Areas In Walking Distance Crosstabulation

Neighborhood		There Are Sufficient Park Areas			Total	
		Yes	Somewhat	No		
Clipper Ridge	Count	53	10	3	66	
	% within What	80.30%	15.20%	4.50%	100.00%	
El Granada	Count	289	97	58	444	
	% within What	65.10%	21.80%	13.10%	100.00%	
Miramar (uninc)	Count	45	13	7	65	
	% within What	69.20%	20.00%	10.80%	100.00%	
Princeton	Count	3	4	2	9	
	% within What	33.30%	44.40%	22.20%	100.00%	
Total	Count	390	124	70	584	
	% within What	66.80%	21.20%	12.00%	100.00%	

Chi Square Probability = 0.075

Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area

Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area			
	Frequency	Percent	
Substantial	163	26.6	
Moderate	212	34.6	
Little	114	18.6	
None	86	14.1	
Unsure	37	6	
Total	612	100	

Need For Small Neighborhood Parks By Children In Household

Kids In Household By Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area Crosstabulation							
Kids In Household		Need For Small Neighborhood Parks In Your Area					Total
		Substantial	Moderate	Little	None	Unsure	
Yes	Count	69	72	24	12	2	179
	% within Kids In Household	38.50%	40.20%	13.40%	6.70%	1.10%	100.00%

Travel Outside of Local Area For Recreation Not Provided Locally

Travel Outside Local Area For Recreation Not Provided Locally				
	Frequency	Percent		
Frequently	72	11.5		
Often	113	18.1		
Occasionally	244	39		
Seldom	149	23.8		
Never	45	7.2		
Other	2	0.3		
Total	625	100		

**Your Interest Level in Recreational Activities, By
HH Ages; Percent Responding High Interest Level**

Activity	Total Percent	Age 15-18 Percent	Age 25-39 Percent	Age 56-74 Percent
Hiking	68.8	67.4	76.2	63.6
Nature Walks	64.1	55.8	65.7	58.8
Dog Walking	54.2	61.9	60.7	48.2
Cycling	47.4	57.1	42.2	40.6
Swimming	37.9	46.3	44.4	27.3
Picnics/BBQ	34.8	35.1	45.5	24.4
Running	30.4	29.3	44.1	17.5
Playground Play	28.7	20.1	46.1	19.3
Tennis	17.9	23.1	21.2	12.1
Basketball	15.9	26.8	19.8	9.5
Soccer	15.2	23.7	18.6	8.9
Golf/Disc Golf	14.5	17.9	15.2	8.6
Skateboarding	14.2	23.7	19.4	10.4
Baseball	12.9	23.7	13.8	9.2
Volleyball	9.3	29.7	9.5	7.4
Bocce Ball	9.1	10.3	7.4	4.7
Roller Skating	8.1	10.5	5.2	5.1
Football	6.7	10.8	8.2	4.8
Hockey	3.6	2.6	4.2	1.1
Handball	3.2	2.6	2.2	4.3
Horseshoes	5.1	0	5.2	3.1
Surfing (Other)	2.7	na	na	na
Fishing (Other)	1.6	na	na	na
Horseback Ride (Other)	1.2	na	na	na
Kayaking (Other)	1.2	na	na	na

**Frequency of Recreational Activities,
Percent Responding Very or Frequently**

Activity		Total Percent	
Hiking		83.2	
Nature Walks		76.9	
Dog Walking		60.5	
Cycling		64.7	
Swimming		39.1	
Picnics/BBQ		44.6	
Running		46.6	
Playground Play		36.7	
Tennis		18.8	
Basketball		10.7	
Soccer		19.8	
Golf/Disc Golf		16.1	
Skateboarding		20.2	
Baseball		10.5	
Volleyball		10.9	
Roller Skating		8.2	
Football		5.7	
Hockey		3.1	
Handball		5.2	
Horseshoes		2.4	

**Importance of Park and Recreation Facilities to You and Your Household;
By HH Ages, Percent Responding High Level**

Activity	Total Percent	Age 15-18 Percent	Age 25-39 Percent	Age 56-74 Percent
Bike Trails	64.2	73.8	66.1	56.2
Unpaved Paths/Trails	62.6	60.1	61.1	59.6
Unimproved Open Space	62.2	49.9	58.4	61.8
Public Restrooms	56.2	46.2	57.2	56.1
Paved Paths/Trails	55.1	51.3	56.7	50.7
Pet Waste Stations	52.5	44.7	61.8	46.4
Benches/Seating	45.3	33.3	44.2	47.4
Passive Parks (Unstructured Use)	44.7	37.1	44.1	40.2
Dog Parks	44.2	42.9	44.1	38.5
Swimming Pool	42.6	56.8	50.1	31.7
Public Parking	41.3	37.8	33.3	43.5
Sm Neighborhood Parks	40.2	30.8	45.6	37.2

Importance of Park and Recreation Facilities to You and Your Household;

By HH h Ages, Percent Responding High Level, Continued

Children's Playground	33.8	23.3	46.7	25.6			
Community Gardens	26.1	22.2	30.4	19.8			
Ball Fields	24.1	46.2	27.5	19.3			
Recreation Programs	23.2	33.3	23.8	17.2			
Boys and Girls Club	21.1	27.9	20.8	14.7			
Skating Parks	17.4	16.7	19.1	11.1			
Tennis Courts	16.8	16.2	22.4	11.2			
Historic Centers	14.3	5.1	12.2	13.3			
Golf Par Course	14.3	23.8	9.9	11.9			
Bocce Ball Area	11.6	23.3	11.1	7.6			
Volleyball Courts	10.1	19.4	11.3	6.1			
Horseshoe Pits	5.2	2.4	6.1	3.9			
Hand Ball Courts	4.1	7.3	3.2	2.1			

Would Participate In More Activities Listed If Available Locally

Would Participate More In Activities Listed If Available Locally				
Would Participate	Frequency	Percent		
Yes	379	65.0		
No	86	14.8		
Maybe	118	20.2		
Total	583	100		

Would Participate In More Activities If Available Locally By Children In HH

Kids In Household By Would Participate More In Activities If Available Locally Crosstabulation

Kids In Household		Would Participate More In Activities			Total	
		Yes	No	Maybe		
Yes	Count	147	8	20	175	
	% within Kids In Household	84.00%	4.60%	11.40%	100.00%	
	Count	147	8	20	175	

Important To Have Community Center

What Neighborhood Do You Live In * Important To Have Community Center Crosstabulation						
Neighborhood		Important To Have Community Center				Total
		Very	Moderate	Not Very	Not Needed	
Clipper Ridge	Count	18	24	16	11	69
	% within What N	26.10%	34.80%	23.20%	15.90%	100.00%
El Granada	Count	115	185	96	50	446
	% within What N	25.80%	41.50%	21.50%	11.20%	100.00%
Miramar	Count	20	27	13	7	67
	% within What N	29.90%	40.30%	19.40%	10.40%	100.00%
Princeton	Count	2	3	1	2	8
	% within What N	25.00%	37.50%	12.50%	25.00%	100.00%
Total	Count	155	239	126	70	590
	% within What N	26.30%	40.50%	21.40%	11.90%	100.00%

- No Significant differences by Where They Lived or by Age
- Substantially, but not significantly, more Important by Children in HH

Should Median Strips In El Granada Be Improved

Should Median Strips in El Granada Be Improved			
	Frequency	Percent	
Yes	336	57.0	
No	112	19.0	
Maybe	141	23.9	
Total	589	100	

Should Median Strips Be Improved By Where You Live

Neighborhood You Live In By Should Median Strips in El Granada Be Improved Crosstabulation

Neighborhood		Should Improve Median Strips			Total	
		Yes	No	Maybe		
Clipper Ridge	Count	27	10	29	66	
	% within What N	40.90%	15.20%	43.90%	100.00%	
El Granada	Count	278	81	83	442	
	% within What N	62.90%	18.30%	18.80%	100.00%	
Miramar	Count	25	17	24	66	
	% within What N	37.90%	25.80%	36.40%	100.00%	
Princeton	Count	4	1	4	9	
	% within What N	44.40%	11.10%	44.40%	100.00%	
	Count	334	109	140	583	
	% within What N	57.30%	18.70%	24.00%	100.00%	

Chi Square Probability = 0.000

Improve Median Strips By The Following Actions

Improve Median Strips By Following Actions		
Improvement With		Percent
Benches and Seating		31.3
Landscaping		48.2
Paths/Walkways		49.9
Picnic Areas/BBQs		32.0
Play Equipment or Swings		24.4
Pet Waste Stations		46.6
Other (see open ended responses)		
Bathrooms		
Trim Trees		
Community Gardens/Flower Gardens		
Clean Up Debris		
Leave Them Alone		
Remove Giant Trees		

Median Strips Most Likely To Use

Median Strip Area Most Likely To Use: Percent Responding Yes

Median Area	Frequency	Percent	
Balboa	172	27.3	
Cabrillo	98	15.6	
Granada	125	19.9	
Portola	141	22.4	
The Alameda	197	31.3	
All	134	21.3	

Importance of Improving Area Or Park, Reporting High Level

Importance of Improving Area or Park, Reporting High Level

Area/Park		Percent		
Burnham Strip		40.8		
Clipper Ridge Park		18.7		
El Granada Strip		41.5		
Quarry Park		31.7		